

## NEWS

Judicial Council of California
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS
Public Information Office
(415) 865-7740

Lynn Holton, Public Information Officer

Release Date: March 22, 2002 Release Number: S.C. 12/02

## SUMMARY OF CASES ACCEPTED DURING THE WEEK OF MARCH 18, 2002

[This news release is issued to inform the public and the press of cases that the Supreme Court has accepted and of their general subject matter. The description or descriptions set out below do not necessarily reflect the view of the court, or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.]

#02-52 *Gerawan Farming, Inc. v. Lyons*, \$104019. (F031142; 94 Cal.App.4th 665.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action.

#02-53 *Wileman Bros. & Elliot, Inc. v. Lyons*, \$104020. (F032298; unpublished opinion.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action.

#02-54 Gerawan Farming, Inc. v. California Table Grape Commission, S103976. (F035605; unpublished opinion.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action.

These three cases include the following issues: (1) What is the appropriate test under article I, section 2 of the state Constitution for determining when the government may compel the funding of collective commercial speech? (2) Is the government interest in an agricultural product marketing order illusory if it allows the majority of those affected by the order, rather than the government, to decide how the program should operate?

(over)

#02-55 *People v. Jones*, S103689. (C029333; unpublished opinion.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of a criminal offense. This case presents the following issues: (1) Did the trial court erroneously remove defendant's appointed counsel, over defendant's objection, for a potential conflict of interest? (2) If so, is such error reversible per se or subject to harmless error analysis, and, if the latter, was the error prejudicial in this case?

#